DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 064 427 UD 012 460

AUTHOR Nalven, Fredric; Oliver, Adela
TITLE Final Report of the Evaluation of the Summer Program for Mentally Retarded Young Adults--Occupational Training Centers. Summer 1970. ESEA Title I.
INSTITUTION Teaching and Learning Research Corp., New York, N.Y.
SPONS AGENCY New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y.
PUB DATE 70
NOTE 54p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Compensatory Education Programs; Guidance Services; *Mentally Handicapped; *Mental Retardation; Occupational Guidance; Program Evaluation; Self Concept; Socialization; Travel Training; *Vocational Education; *Young Adults; Youth Programs
IDENTIFIERS *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; ESEA Title I; New York City

ABSTRACT

The 1970 Summer Program for Mentally Retarded Young Adults Occupational Training Centers program, funded under Title I of the 1965 Elementary Secondary Education Act, was designed to serve the summer educational, prevocational, and social needs of approximately 170 retarded adolescents and young adults. The general objectives of the project were to meet the following needs of the enrolled retarded young people: (1) to improve self-image through activities to promote socialization skills; (2) to develop leisure time skills and independence; (3) for training in the use of community resources; (4) for travel training; (5) to improve employability potential through work experiences; (6) to orient new students to the Occupational Training Centers; (7) to provide vocational and personal guidance; and, (8) to improve physical fitness. In order to evaluate the degree to which these objectives were met, repeated site visits were made to the two Summer Occupational Training Centers. It was found that the two centers had quite different approaches to meeting the objectives: whereas one center used a carefully preplanned and highly structured program featuring "tracking," the other used a less structured, more flexible, and in certain respects, more creative program. (Authors/JM)

ED 064427

FUNCTION #915658

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

FINAL REPORT OF THE EVALUATION OF THE

SUMMER 1970

SUMMER PROGRAM FOR MENTALLY RETARDED YOUNG ADULTS-OCCUPATIONAL TRAINING CENTERS

Evaluation of a New York City school district educational project funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (PL 89-10), performed under contract with the Board of Education of the City of New York for the Summer 1970.

UD 012460

TEACHING & LEARNING
RESEARCH CORP.

355 Lexington Avenue/New York, New York 10017/212-490-0197

SUMMER PROGRAM FOR MENTALLY RETARDED
YOUNG ADULTS-OCCUPATIONAL TRAINING CENTERS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
	Acknowledgements	ii
	List of Tables	iii
	Executive Summary	iv
I.	Description of the Project	1
II.	General Objectives of the Project	2
III.	Objectives of the Evaluation	3
IV.	Methods and Procedures	3
V.	Results of the Evaluation	4
	Teacher Questionnaires	7
	The Parent Questionnaires	19
	The Student Questionnaires	27
VI.	Summary and Conclusions	32
Appendix A	The Teacher Questionnaire	35
Appendix B	The Parent Questionnaire	40
Appendix C	The Student Questionnaire	45

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Teaching & Learning Research Corp. evaluation team wish to acknowledge the wholehearted cooperation, openness, and support given them by the staff, parents, and students involved in the Summer Occupational Training Center Program. We wish to especially thank Mr. Neil Wasserman, Mrs. Alma Prosperi, Mr. Dominic Pirroglia, and Miss Madeline Dalton for their enthusiastic willingness to have the results of their ambitious efforts scrutinized.

SUMMER PROGRAM FOR MENTALLY RETARDED
YOUNG ADULTS-OCCUPATIONAL TRAINING CENTERS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The 1970 Summer Program for Mentally Retarded Young Adults Occupational Training Centers program was designed to serve the summer educational, prevocational, and social needs of approximately 170 retarded adolescents and young adults, most of whom had made application to enroll in Occupational Training Centers (about 12%). or who were already enrolled in such centers (about 88%).

The two Occupational Training Centers locations for the summer programs were:

a) 721K, 2075 84th Street, Brooklyn, New York and
b) 721R, Prospect and Harvard Avenues, Staten Island, N.Y.

The Brooklyn Center, whose supervisory teacher was Mr. Neil Wasserman, had 75 regularly attending trainees, had an additional staff of 7 teachers, 1 secretary, and 2 paraprofessional aides. This program involved six shops and a class for Work Study and Travel Training. Although shop assignments were highly planned and structured, grouping of students for trips and other recreational activities was flexibly handled without segregation according to sex or Educable-Trainable Status.

The Richmond Center, supervised by Mrs. Alma Prosperi, had an additional staff of 5 teachers, 1 secretary and 2 paraprofessional aides. This entire program of shops, trips, and other activities was very carefully preplanned with the students in fixed groupings according to sex and Educable-Training status.

The programs were conducted from 9 A.M. to 2 P.M., Mondays through Fridays, from July 6th through August 14th, 1970. Overall coordination of the programs was the responsibility of Mr. Dominic Pirraglia.

The evaluation of this program by the Teaching & Learning Research Corp, involved three basic aspects:

1) a conference between 2 members of the evaluation team with Miss Madeline Dalton and Mr. Dominic Pirraglia of the B.C.R.M.D.
2) site visits by a member of the evaluation team, and
3) face-to-face interviews, and the completion of lengthly questionnaires, with eleven teachers

(who completed sixty questionnaires regarding individual students' experiences in the program), twenty-two parents and twenty-three students.

The major results of the evaluation were as follows:

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The 1970 Summer Occupational Training Centers programs (1 in Brooklyn and 1 in Richmond) for approximately 170 mentally retarded trainees, aged 17 - 21, were designed to serve the summer educational prevocational, and social needs of current and prospective Occupational Training Centers enrollees.

The staff of eleven instructors along with directors, a guidance counselor, and paraprofessional aides were experienced in teaching the retarded.

The programs were found to be well organized, ambitiously implemented, and thoroughly enjoyed by the enrollees and very well received by their parents.

Whereas the shop programs of both Occupational Training Centers were similar in structure and content, the Richmond Occupational Training Center was found to be much more highly planned and structured than the Brooklyn Occupational Training Center. Whereas the entire Richmond program, including trips, was carefully planned prior to the onset of the program, the Brooklyn staff, during the daily morning meetings, planned their trips and recreational activities a day or two in advance. Another major difference was in the grouping procedures. The Richmond program segregated the students on the basis of sex and Trainable-Educable status whereas the Brooklyn program flexibly grouped students on the basis of interest in a given activity without respect to sex or Trainable-Educable status.

The Summer Occupational Training Center programs, according to our observations and the quantitive results obtained from teachers, parents and students, were found to have successfully completed their missions with very few exceptions. That is, a very worthwhile summer program was established for young adult retardates which enhanced their educational, prevocational, recreational, social, and travel potentials. Of course, in the brief period of summer program operated, just so much could be accomplished in any of these areas.

The students, by their own reports, as well as those obtained from their parents and teachers, were left at the end of the program with many important unmet, or partially unmet needs that could be handled by their future Occupational Training Center experiences. These major needs, and suggested ways of dealing with them, follow:

The students' capacity to travel independently on public transportation throughout New York City remains quite limited. Much more extensive travel training is obviously required if these students are to be able to maximize their occupational and recreational opportunities.

The students' ability to relate to members of the opposite sex remains a problem area. Whereas they seem able to relate to, form friendship with, and communicate with their same-sex peers, they seem incapable of doing so with the opposite sex. It was recommended that role-playing, simulation, and other "psychodramatic" techniques be employed for dealing with this problem.

Many students, in the view of their parents and teachers, lack the communication skills involved in obtaining employment. In addition to greater speech therapy offerings, future Occupational Training Center programs would be well advised to utilize role-playing, simulation, and "psychodramatic" techniques in this area, too.

More help is urgently needed in the area of money mathematics and usage. For instance, many students did not even know the money value of the transportation tokens they were provided with. Most parents felt that their children were unable to use money responsibly. Traditional techniques, as well as simulation procedures involving shopping, budgeting, etc. should be employed.

The students still need much more help and guidance in formulating specific vocational goals as well as concrete realistic experiences with the machines, materials, settings and procedures that they would actually use in employment settings. Paid part-time work in actual commercial and industrial settings seems to be a very worthwhile goal towards which future programs should strive.

SUMMER PROGRAM FOR MENTALLY RETARDED
YOUNG ADULTS OCCUPATIONAL TRAINING CENTERS

I. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT

The 1970 Summer Program for Mentally Retarded Young Adults Occupational Training Centers program was designed to serve the summer educational, prevocational, and social needs of approximately 170 retarded adolescents and young adults, most of whom had made application to enroll in Occupational Training Centers (about 12%) or who are now enrolled in such centers (about 88%).

The two Occupational Training Centers locations housing the summer programs were:

a. 721K, 2075 84th Street, Brooklyn, New York 11214
b. 721R, Prospect and Harvard Avenues, Staten Island, (Richmond) New York 10301

Mr. Dominic Pirroglia oversaw both centers as part of his Bureau of CRMD summer supervisory duties.

The Brooklyn Occupational Training Centers program's supervising teacher was Mr. Neil Wasserman. The assigned guidance counselor was Mr. Marvin Jacobson.

This program involved six shops: Publications, Food Preparation and Service, Garment Trades, Building Maintainence, Messenger Service, and General-Industrial.

In addition, one class was formed for Work Study and Travel Training. Such students enrolled here were Job Corps enrollees half-time and Occupational Training Center enrollees half-time.

The Brooklyn Occupational Training Center's official register listed 95 trainees. However, only 75 trainees actually became involved in the program and these did so with excellent attendance records. Family vacations, time taken out for camp programs, and concurrent involvements in similar programs accounted for almost all absences.

Funds were allocated for 7 teachers, 1 secretary, and 2 paraprofessional aides in addition to the supervising teacher.

The Richmond Occupational Training Center program's supervising teacher was Mrs. Alma Prosperi. Five shops were involved: Publications and Messenger Service, Building Maintenance, General Industrial, Garment Trades, and Food Preparation and Service. The starting roster contained 76 students but 6 never showed up and were dropped from the register. Of the remaining 70 students, 60-70 attended daily on the average. The Richmond Occupational Training Center was staffed by 5 teachers, 1 secretary, and 2 paraprofessional aides in addition to the supervisory teacher.

All teachers from the Summer Occupational Training Centers programs were licensed CRMD teachers and, with one or two exceptions, taught in Occupational Training Centers during the regular school year.

Staffing of the centers was conducted in accordance with the hiring priorities laid down in the Board of Education Circular #92 which deals with "Staffing in Title I Schools".

The programs were conducted from 9AM to 2 PM, Mondays through Fridays, from July 6th through August 14th, 1970.

II. GENERAL OBJECTIVES OF THE PROJECT

The Summer Occupational Training Centers Program was designed to meet the following needs of the enrolled retarded young people:

1. To improve self-image through activities to promote socialization skills.

2. To develop leisure time skills and independence.

3. For training in the use of community resources.

4. For travel training.

5. To improve employability potential through work experiences.

6. To orient new students to the Occupational Training Centers.

7. To provide vocational and personal guidance.

8. To improve physical fitness.

III. OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

1. To describe the scope, sequence, organization and implementation of the program.

2. To determine the nature of behaviorial change such as relating to the opposite sex, reactions to criticism, etc. which may be indicative of increased maturity.

3. To determine the improvement of utilization of leisure time skills during the six week summer period.

4. To determine improvement in occupational skills through work experiences.

5. To determine the ability to travel independently.

6. To determine the gains made in physical fitness during the six-week summer period.

IV. METHODS AND PROCEDURES

A. A conference was held at the outset of the evaluation between two members of the Teaching & Learning Research Corp. staff (Dr. Fredric B. Nalven and Mrs. Adela Oliver) and two members of the Bureau of CRMD staff involved in the Occupational Training Centers programs (Miss Madeline Dalton, Acting Director, and Mr. Dominic Pirraglia, Assistant Coordinator).

B. Repeated site visits by a member of the Teaching & Learning Research Corp. evaluation team were made to the two Summer Occupational Training Centers. These visits were made to evaluate the scope, sequence, organization, and implementation of the program.

C. Questionnaires were designed and individually administered (presented orally and responses recorded by a Teaching & Learning evaluation team member) to a sample of teachers, parents,

and program enrollees. The results of these questionnaires, which covered all aspects of the program's objectives, were analyzed and reported quantitatively. Sixty students were evaluated by means of Teacher Questionnaires (completed by eleven teachers), twenty-two Parent Questionnaires were completed, and twenty-three Student Questionnaires were administered.

V. RESULTS OF THE EVALUATION

Before turning to an extensive discussion of the Questionnaire results, which form the major (and quantitative) findings of the evaluation, the overall impressions gained by the Teaching & Learning evaluation team will be discussed. These impressions were gained during the site visits and from the questionnaire results to be described below.

All of the students enrolled in both the Brooklyn and Richmond Occupational Training Centers programs appeared happy with their programs and were well motivated regarding attendance, punctuality, and participation. The staffs of both programs appeared well-trained, hard working, and eager to provide an excellent experience for the enrollees. They attempted, with much success, to implement all of the program objectives. Staff morale was high, program organization and implementation were very favorable, and a very effective teaching and learning situation emerged.

Observation of the two Occupational Training Centers revealed some very significant differences in their structure and organization, although they seemed equally effective. Whereas both programs had highly structured and carefully organized shop programs, the overall tones, especially in regard to trips and other recreational activities, were very different. Whereas the Richmond program was carefully preplanned and highly structured throughout, programming and implementation of the Brooklyn program was less structured, more flexible, and in certain respects, more creative.

In the Richmond center, the staff was very conscious of Educable and Trainable labels, and the students were set in "tracks" accordingly. Clearly, a very high value was placed in homogeneous grouping. The Brooklyn center did not label the students, and heterogenity of grouping prevailed. In Richmond, where the entire summer program, including trips, was planned in advance, down to the last detail of the overall program, as well as each individual's own program, students were divided on

the basis of EMR - TMR label and sex. The Brooklyn program, in contrast, except for shop activities, was much more open-ended. Groupings shifted flexibly and cut across EMR-TMR categories and sex. Sex segregation, for example, was actually not necessary in the Richmond program except for the once-a-week swimming session at a nearby high school (which had only one locker room) but was chosen because it evidently was consistent with that program director's views about how such a program should be organized.

Whereas the Richmond program, as already mentioned, was carefully planned prior to the summer, the Brooklyn Occupational Training Center staff planned a day or two ahead at the morning staff conferences held twenty minutes before "official" opening time. Planning of trips, for instance, was based on the staff's perception of the students' current interests and were shaped on the basis of what occurred on previous trips, etc.

The Brooklyn Occupational Training Centers seemed to attempt, through heterogeneous groupings in shops, and on trips, to raise the level of functioning of the more dependent enrollees by having them associate with, and to an extent, be guided by, the more independent students. Naturally, however, a degree of smoothness was not attained as it was in the Richmond program where the homogeneous grouping made matters somewhat less complicated since sub-groups of homogeneous students operated more or less at the same level of ability, interest, and degree of independence.

THE SAMPLES AND QUESTIONNAIRES

A. TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRES: A fifty-item questionnaire, reproduced in the Appendix was compleded by all eleven teachers on 60 of the OTC students. Twenty-five of these students attended the Richmond OTC (5 students randomly selected from each of the 5 shops) and 35 were Brooklyn OTC trainees (5 students randonly selected from each of the 5 shops and 5 from the work-study program). Of these sixty students, 32 were males and 28 females. Forty-seven were classified as Educable Mental Retardates and 13 as Trainable Mental Retardates. Each questionnaire was individually administered in a face-to-face interview conducted with these teachers by a member of the Teaching & Learning evaluation team.

The Teacher Questionnaire was composed of 36 items requiring a simple Yes or No response, 1 item requiring the teacher to indicate the student's percentage of days in attendance at the program, and the remainder of the 60 items requiring a qualitative or narrative comment by the teacher.

The Teacher Questionnaire's 60 items covered the following areas: the student's knowledge of the purposes and programs involved in the Occupational Training Center, the liklihood of his continuing in an OTC after the summer, his parents' knowledge of, attitudes towards, and contacts with the staff of the Occupational Training Center program, the students' travel skills, his specific occupational preferences or interests, his needs for further educational and occupational training, his hobbies, avocational interests, and leisure-time pursuits, his awareness of the existence and location of local community resources, his knowledge of the value of money and transportation tokens, his communication skills; his cultural interests and pursuits, his motot coordination and manual dexterity, his social functioning, peer relationships, how well the student relates to members of the opposite sex and Occupational Training Center staff, his attendance and lateness problems, the extent to which the student and his parents seem satisfied with the Summer Occupational Training Center Program, what features of the program has failed him, and what additional Occupational Training Center Summer Programs would be of help to the trainee.

B. THE PARENT QUESTIONNAIRES: One or both parents of 22 of the Summer Occupational Training Center students completed a questionnaire concerning their child's participation in the program. Of these 22 students, 13 were males and 9 females. 17 were

Educably Mentally Retarded trainees, and 5 were Trainable Mental Retardates. 10 of the students were from Richmond and 12 were from Brooklyn. The Parent Questionnaire, reproduced in the Appendix, contained 44 items and, for the most part, paralleled the items comprising the Teacher Questionnaire described above. This questionnaire, in all but two instances, was individually administered to the parent in a face-to-face interview conducted by a member of the Teaching & Learning evaluation team. In the two exceptional cases, the questionnaire was administered by the director of the Richmond Summer Occupational Training Program since the parents and a Teaching & Learning evaluation team member could not work out a mutually convenient appointment time.

C. THE STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE: Twenty-three students (10 from the Richmond Occupational Training Center and 13 from the Brooklyn Occupational Training Center) responded to questionnaires administered individually in a face-to-face interview with a member of the Teaching & Learning evaluation team. Originally, 26 students were randomly selected, but three proved to be too limited verbally to respond to the questionnaire items meaningfully. 14 of the students were male and 9 female. 5 were classified as Trainable and 18 Educable.

All 23 of these students were also among the total of 60 students evaluated in the Teacher Questionnaires, and 5 were among those students who were evaluated in the Parent Questionnaires.

The thirty items comprising the Student Questionnaire paralleled the contents of the Teacher Questionnaire described above. However, the wording of the items was altered so as to be within the grasp of the limited verbal skills of the trainees. This questionnaire is reproduced in the Appendix. (Note: an attempt was made to make comparisons among the three sets of questionnaires easier by using the same item numbers for substantially the same item contents in the Teacher, Parent, and Student Questionnaires. Since there were more items included in the Teacher Questionnaires, a few item numbers were skipped in the Parent and Student Questionnaires).

RESULTS OF THE QUESTIONNAIRES

A. THE TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE: The results of the Teacher Questionnaires were analyzed separately for the 35 cases completed by the Brooklyn Occupational Training Center teachers and for the 25 Richmond Occupational Training Center teachers and then for the total of 60 cases.

Items 1 - 11 required a simple Yes or No answer. The item contents and the results follow:

Item No.	Content	Number of Yes Responses: Brooklyn OTC (N=35)	Richmond OTC (N=25)	Totals (N=60)
1.	Does this trainee seem to know the purposes of the programs involved in the OTC?	34	25	59
2.	Does it seem likely that he will continue in the OTC after this summer?	32	21	53
3.	Have his parents been orientated to the OTC's programs and purposes?	31	25	56
4.	Have you had any direct contact with his parents?	19	13	32
5.	Do his parents seem ready to support his participation in the OTC?	30	25	55
6.	Have his parents become actively involved in OTC parent workshops?	4	11	15
7.	Is this child capable of traveling between his home and the OTC?	35	25	60
8.	Can he independently use public transportation to make short trips within his home borough?	27	23	50
9.	Does he seem to have a good grasp of the layout of his neighborhood?	28	22	50
10.	Is he capable of using public transportation throughout New York City?	21	15	36

Item No.	Content	Number of Yes Responses: Brooklyn OTC (N-35)	Richmond OTC (N=25)	Totals (N=60)
11.	Since entering the Summer OTC program, has he gained in capacity to independently use public transportation?	23	22	45

For the 59 of the 60 cases, the teachers indicated that they felt that the purposes and programs of the Occupational Training Center were known by the students. The one exception was a Brooklyn Occupational Training Center student about whom the teacher was unsure. From the teacher's standpoint, then, it appears that the students were suitably informed as to what their program was all about.

The vast majority (53 out of 60) of students were judged by their teachers as being likely to continue in their Occupational Training Center after the summer was over. In all the remaining cases, subsequent questioning revealed, the reason for the students' not continuing was that they had reached the upper age limit and would consequently have to be "graduated". Thus, all students eligible to continue in the Occupational Training Center Program were judged likely to do so by their teachers.

In 56 out of 60 cases, the teachers reported that the students' parents had been oriented to the Occupational Training Centers programs and purposes. The four exceptions were all Brooklyn Occupational Training Center students whose teachers indicated that they were not sure whether or not the parents had been thus informed. At any rate, for the most part, it appears that the teachers considered the parents to be aware of what the program involved.

In 55 out of 60 cases, the teacher responded positively to the question of whether the students' parents seemed ready to support his participation in the Occupational Training Center. The 5 exceptions were "don't know" responses from Brooklyn Occupational Training Center teachers. (This trend of many more "don't know" responses among Brooklyn, as compared to Richmond Occupational Training Center teachers continued throughout the questionnaire. It suggested that the Brooklyn teachers either

did not know their students as well as did the Richmond teachers or were simply being more honest when they felt uncertain about many of the questions).

Only 15 out of the 60 students' parents, according to the teachers, were actively involved in Occupational Training Center parent workshops. Such parent involvement was judged far more prevalent among the Richmond student sample than among the Brooklyn sample. In any case, it appeared that the Occupational Training Center staff had not been successful in involving the parents in such orientation groups. This can be judged as a failure of the program's since such parent participation was one of the stated objectives of the Summer Occupational Training Center program.

In all cases,the students were judged by their teachers to be capable of traveling between their homes and the Occupational Training Center. This is not surprising, since most of the students had attended their Occupational Training Centers for varying periods prior to this summer. Consequently, there was no reason to view this travel as a new accomplishment acquired during the summer program.

50 of the 60 students were judged capable of making short trips within their home boroughs. The proportion thus judged was somewhat higher among the Richmond students. This may reflect differences in the travel facilities and problems peculiar to each of these two boroughs or, as was alluded to above, the Brooklyn teachers were more ready to admit to their own and their students' "shortcomings." The same number(i.e. 50 out of 60) of students were judged to have a good grasp of the layout of their neighborhood. Since the two items involved probably tap the same or similar travel skills, the similar response frequencies were expected. It seems clear that travel, even at a neighborhood level, remains a problem for about one out of six Occupational Training Center enrollees. In only 36 out of 60 cases were the students judged by their teachers to be capable of city-wide independent travel. This further supports the assertion that these students require considerably more travel training.

When asked whether their students had made gains in capacity to travel independently on public conveyences since entering the Summer Occupational Training Center program, the teachers indicated that 45 out of the 60 students had made such gains. The proportion judged having made such gains was considerably higher among the Richmond Occupational Training Center group. Since travel training was one of the primary objectives of the Summer Occupational Training Center program, it appeared that the teachers

did not judge their program to be as effective in this regard as would have been hoped.

Item No. 12 asked the teachers, "Does this trainee have any specific occupational preference or interests? If yes, please describe." For 29 of the sixty cases (18 from Brooklyn and 11 from Richmond), the response was "Yes". The listed interests and preferences were quite varied and included "counterboy, dishwasher, clerical work, radio announcer, post office, typing, dressmaking, factory work, hospital work, sewing, sheltered workshop activity, and woodworking." Thus, a slight majority of the students appear to be thusfar without any specific occupational preferences or interests. Since the development of such preferences and interests was a key objective of the Summer Occupational Center program, it appears that the program has not been very successful in this regard. With the possible exception of the "radio announcer" response, however, it seems that those students who have formulated such interests have done so in a fairly realistic manner.

Item No. 13 asked, "Do you feel that you know what further educational and occupational training is most advisable for this child? If yes, please describe". In 50 of the 60 cases, the teachers responded "Yes". The teachers prescriptions were widely varied and included "remedial reading and math, clerical work, sheltered workshop experience, enrollment in an Occupational Training Center in the Fall, cashier training, special vocational training, housecare and gardening". These recommendations seemed very worthwhile, and it appears advisable that they be incorporated into the offerings of subsequent Occupational Training Center programs. Since in 10 of the 60 cases, the teachers could not make any recommendations of any kind, it appears that a sizeable number of students are in need of further prevocational evaluations to better determine their needs in this area.

Item No. 14 asked "Does this trainee have any specific hobbies or avocational interests? If yes, please describe." In 34 out of 60 cases, the teachers answered "Yes". The most frequent hobbies or interests were "T.V." (13 cases), "swimming" (8 cases), bowling (7 cases), sports (6 cases), music (5 cases), and reading (4 cases). Others included arts and crafts, movies, basebell, toy soldiers, cars and trucks, electric trains, typing, cooking, writing, knitting, hooking rugs, setting stones in jewelry, photography, sorting papers, cards and games. Thus, these students appear to have a wide variety of interests, many

of which could be developed into worthwhile life-long leisure time pursuits and some of which might become marketable skills. Needless to say, subsequent Occupational Training Center programs should strive to discover, encourage, and extend such interests in the enrollees.

In only 34 of the 60 cases did the teachers respond "Yes" to Item No. 15 which asked, "Since entering the summer program, has he made any progress towards the development of avocational interests?". A similar number (37) of students were judged to "have any established recreational and leisure-time pursuits." (Item No. 16)

From these two items, it appears that only a little more than half of the Summer Occupational Training Center enrollees have moved very far along the road toward the development of such avocational, recreational, or leisure time pursuits.

Item No. 17 asked, specifically, "Has he made any progress in this area this summer? If yes, please describe." In only 31 out of 60 cases did the teachers respond "Yes." Here too, then, is support to the notion that almost half of the students seriously lack progress in this direction. For those students who were judged to have made such progress, the teachers indicated a variety of areas of developing interests including "bowling, photography, arts and crafts, knitting, swimming, and sports".

In general, since the development of such interests was one of the main stated objectives of the Summer Occupational Training Center program, it would appear that the teachers felt that they had been relatively unsuccessful in achieving this end as much as they would have liked. Of course, anyone who has worked with retardates of this age knows full well how difficult it can be to stimulate sustained interests of this kind in those youngsters.

Further evidence of this difficulty was supplied by the responses to the next two items.

Item No. 18 asked, "Is he capable of independently selecting and initiating his own leisure time and recreational activities? In 39 of the 60 cases, the teachers responded "Yes".

Item No. 19 asked, "Has he made any progress towards this goal this summer?" The teachers answered affirmatively in 36 of the 60 cases. Here too, the program's success has been relatively modest but, considering the cognitive and affective inertia

characteristic of these enrollees, these results are perhaps all that could be reasonably expected.

Item No. 20 was a survey of the students' knowledge of various community resources. The item contents and affirmative response rates were as follows:

Questions	Number of "Yes" responses (N=60)
Is he aware of the existence and location of:	
a) local recreation centers such as Y's, boys clubs, etc.?	42
b) movie theaters in his neighborhood?	53
c) bowling alleys in his neighborhood?	49
d) swimming facilities in his neighborhood?	51
e) public parks in his neighborhood?	51
f) municipal facilities, such as police and fire stations, post offices and health centers in his neighborhood?	45

For the most part, it appears from these responses that the teachers judged about 50 of the 60 students to be fairly knowledgable concerning the existence and location of their community's resources. Affirmative response rates to these questions were generally higher for the Richmond students and may well reflect the more insular nature of the Staten Island Community. Apparently, then, it is not an absence of knowledge of recreational opportunities that keeps these students from being more active during their leisure time.

Items No. 21 - 28 required simple "Yes" or "No" answers and dealt with the areas of the money, transportation tokens, and communication skills and problems. The item contents and the results follow:

Item No. Content	Number of "Yes" Responses Brooklyn OTC (N=35)	Richmond OTC (N=25)	Totals (N=60)
21. Has he demonstrated to you that he knows the value of money and can use it responsibly?	24	16	40
22. Does he use his transportation tokens responsibly?	35	25	60
23. Does he know the money equivalent of these tokens?	30	21	51
24. Can he communicate effectively with you?	32	24	56
25. Can he communicate effectively with his fellow students?	33	23	56
26. Can he communicate well enough to obtain employment?	19	19	38
27. Does he have any communication problems which would interfere with his ability to socialize with peers?	7	4	11
28. Should he receive professional speech therapy help during the upcoming school year?	13	10	23

The teachers judged only two-thirds of the students to know the value of money and to be able to use it responsibly. However, in contrast, all of the students were seen as using their transportation tokens responsibly, even though not all of the students were seen as being aware of the monetary equivalent of their tokens. It thus appears that the students do what they are expected to do when given tokens, but there is still a need for many of them to be taught the fundamentals of our monetary and economic system if they are to function competently and independently in the realm of personal finances, even in a limited manner.

Most of the students were judged effective in their capacity to communicate with their teachers and classmates. However, only 38 out of 60 were judged able to communicate effectively enough to obtain employment. This suggests that these Occupational Training Center enrollees could profit from extensive role-playing and similar simulation techniques which provide an opportunity to acquire and rehearse the kinds of communication problems they would confront in an employment situation.

Only 11 of the 60 students were seen by their teachers as having communication problems which would be handicapping in relating to their peers, and 23 of them were judged to be in need of speech therapy. Although they are clearly in the minority, there appears to be enough Occupational Training Center enrollees with speech and communication problems to warrant extensive (but selective and individually prescribed) speech therapy services as part of the regular Occupational Training Center program.

Item No. 29 asked, "Does he have any cultural interests or pursuits? If yes, please describe." Of the 60 students, only 15 (4 from Brooklyn and 11 from Richmond) were rated affirmatively by their teachers on this question. Muscial interests accounted for most of these cases. Arts and crafts, folk dancing, photography, painting, reading, and T.V. were also reported by the teachers in response to this item.

Item No. 30 asked, "Have his cultural horizons been broadened since he entered the Summer Program?" In 37 of the 60 cases, the teachers responded "Yes". This is difficult to interpret since, if only 15 students had cultural interests or pursuits, how could 37 have had their cultural horizon broadened this summer? At any rate, since the broadening of such interests was one of the stated objectives of the Summer Occupational Training Center program, it seems fair to say that the program did not make as much progress in this area as would be expected from a successful educational experience.

The next four items dealt with motor coordination and manual dexterity. Item No. 31 asked, "Does he have any noticable problems with gross motor coordination?" 16 students (12 from Brooklyn and 4 from Richmond) were judged by their teachers to have such problems (superficial observation by a member of the Teaching & Learning evaluation team suggested that the Richmond percentage of "Yes" responses was spuriously low and gives further support to the hypothesis that the Brooklyn Occupational Training Center staff was more willing to honestly admit problems than were their Richmond counterparts).

Item No. 32 asked, "Has his motor coordination improved since entering this Summer's Program?" Twenty-three students (7 from Brooklyn and 16 from Richmond) were judged by their teachers as having thus improved.

Item No. 34 asked, "Has his manual dexterity improved since entering this program?" 27 of the 60 students were rated by their teachers as having undergone such improvement. While these specific figures are somewhat suspect and difficult to interpret, they suggest that there are enough dexterity and coordination problems among the Occupational Training Center students for physical education and perhaps physical therapy facilities to be required as important integral features of subsequent programs.

Item No. 35 asked the teachers to rate their students as either independent, semi-independent, or very independent with regard to social functioning. The results were as follows:

Rating	Brooklyn OTC N = 35	Richmond OTC N = 25	Totals N = 60
Independent	10	15	25
Semi-Independent	18	9	27
Very Dependent	7	1	8

For the total group approximately 42% of the students were rated as independent, 45% as semi-independent, and 13% as very dependent. The Richmond group was rated as much more independent than the Brooklyn group (60% vs. 28% respectively). This appears to be another example of the tendency of the Brooklyn Occupational Training Center staff to view their trainees more critically than does the Richmond Occupational Training Center staff. At any rate, the total ratings clearly indicate that, in the view of their teachers, the vast majority of the Occupational Training Center enrollees are capable of independent or semi-independent social functioning. This further highlights the need for these students to have as much help as possible in the areas of communication, travel, and vocational guidance so as to permit them to maximize their potentials for independent living.

Items No. 36 - 39 dealt with the students' peer relationships. The item contents and affirmative response frequencies follow:

Item No.	Content	Number of "Yes" responses: Brooklyn OTC N = 35	Richmond OTC N = 25	Totals N=60
36.	Is he able to relate to his peers in a satisfactory manner?	30	24	54
37.	Is he well liked by his peers?	31	23	54
38.	Does he seem to have any friends among his fellow trainees?	32	24	56
39.	Can he relate appropriately to members of the opposite sex?	22	21	43

The vast majority of students were rated by their teachers as having satisfactory peer relationships and as being well liked by, as well as having friends among, their fellow trainees. Thus, no major problems seemed to have emerged in this area. How well they fare among their intellectually "normal" age-mates, however, is an entirely different question, but one which was not dealt with. The teachers, especially in the Brooklyn Occupational Training Center, were less favorable in their judgements of the students' capacity to relate appripriately to members of the opposite sex. This suggests the need for more opportunities for the student to learn the necessary social skills involved in heterosexual relationships. In addition to the social activities already employed in the Summer Occupational Training Center programs for this purpose, specific role-playing techniques would appear to be a worthwhile undertaking in the future.

Items No. 40 - 41 asked the teachers to indicate the students' social adjustment problems in general and to assess the appropriatness of his relationships with the staff. The results indicated that the teachers viewed the students to be generally free of any major problems in this area, except for tendencies towards shyness and quietness. Here too, role-playing, simulation, and o other "psychodramatic" techniques appear to be worthwhile projects for future Occupational Training Center programs to undertake.

Items No. 42 -45 dealt with the students' attendence and lateness. The results overwhelmingly indicated that there were no attendance or lateness problems beyond those expected in any summer educational program. Average daily attendance, for

example, was reported to be better than 95%.

Items 46 - 47 asked the teachers whether the student seemed to be enjoying the Summer Occupational Training Center program and whether or not his parents seemed satisfied with it. The staff of both Occupational Training Centers responded almost universally in a manner indicating that the programs were enjoyed by the students and satisfied the students' parents.

Item No. 48 asked , "What features of the program have proven most helpful to him". The items mentioned, and the number of instances in which they were mentioned follow: trips, 25; the whole program, 14; shops, 18; recreation and sports, 7; travel training, 6; paid work experiences, 6; and speech therapy, 1. These results do not reveal anything specific about the most beneficial aspects of the Summer Occupational Training Center program. Rather, it appears that the teachers felt all aspects of the program have been helpful.

Item No. 49 asked, "In what way has the program failed him, if any." In 43 of the 60 cases, the teachers could not point to any way in which the program failed the students. Of the remaining cases, areas of failure included unmet needs in the areas of more help with job placement, help with grooming, psychiatric help, the need for more trips, the need for a longer program, specific job training, and more speech therapy. Future programs might well strive to provide for all of these needs.

Item No. 50 asked, "What additional Occupational Training Center Summer Programs would be of help to this trainee?" In 16 cases, the teachers were unable to specify any recommendations. The most frequent prescriptions, along with the number of instances in which they were mentioned, follow:

Recommendations	Number of instances mentioned
Emphasis of socialization and leisure time activities	9
Help with personal grooming	9
Paid work-study programs	7
Specific vocational training	5
Speech Therapy	4
Rotating shop experiences	3

Recommendations	Number of Instances mentioned
Help with money arithmetic	3
Vocational Guidance and Job-Site visits	2
Psychiatric help	2

All of these recommendations seem to be worthwhile, and it is consequently urged that future Summer Occupational Training Center programs (as well as regular school-year programs) be shaped accordingly.

B. THE PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE: The results of the Parent Questionnaire were analyzed for the total of 22 parent interviews (12 from the Brooklyn Occupational Training Center and 10 from the Richmond Occupational Training Center).

Items 1 - 11 required a simple "Yes" or "No" answer and were identical (except for minor changes in wording) to those of the Teacher Questionnaire described in the preceding section. The item contents and results follow:

Item No.	Content	Number of "Yes" responses (N = 22)
1.	Does your son seem to know the purposes and the programs involved in the OTC?	22
2.	Does it seem likely that he will continue in the OTC after this summer?	17
3.	Have you been oriented to the OTC's programs and purposes?	21
4.	Have you had any direct contact with his teachers?	21
5.	Do you support his participation in the OTC?	22

Item No.	Content	Number of "Yes" responses (N = 22)
6.	Have you become actively involved in the OTC parent workshops?	11
7.	Is your child capable of traveling between his home and the OTC?	22
8.	Can he independently use public transportation to make short trips within his home borough?	18
9.	Does he seem to have a good grasp of the layout of his neighborhood?	22
10.	Is he capable of using public transportation throughout New York City?	9
11.	Since entering the Summer OTC program, has he gained in capacity to independently use public transportation?	18

The proportion of parents responding affirmatively to all of these eleven items closely approximates the results of the Teacher Questionnaire. That is, the parents' reports agreed with those of the teachers'. In summary, the results of these eleven items indicated that: according to the parents, the Occupational Training Center trainees and the parents were well oriented to the purposes and programs of the Occupational Training Center; eligible students are expected to continue in the Occupational Training Center after the summer; most of the parents had some contact with their children's teachers; all of the parents support their children's participation in the Occupational Training Center; only half of the parents had been actively involved in Occupational Training Center parents workshops. All of the parents believed their children capable of traveling between their homes and the Occupational Training Center. They believed that most of the trainees could independently make short trips on public conveyences within their home borough and that all of the children had a good grasp of the layout of their neighborhoods. However, less than 40% of the parents felt that their children were capable of using public trans-

portation throughout New York City. However, almost 80% felt that some improvement had been made in this area since the start of the Summer Occupational Training Center program. These results support the notion that the Summer Occupational Training Center Program's travel training has been effective but that these trainees need considerably more of it before most of them will be able to travel independently throughout the city and thereby maximize their vocational and recreational opportunities.

Item No. 12 asked the parents, "Does this trainee have any specific occupational preferences or interests? If yes, please describe." Only 9 out of 22 parents responded affirmatively. This proportion (almost 40%) closely approximated the proportion of teachers (48%) who responded similarly. Furthermore, the parents reports of the types of interests (almost exclusively menial occupations) were almost identical to those reported by the teachers.

That is, parents and teachers both indicated that less than half of the trainees had as yet formulated any specific occupational goals but those who had, did so appropriately. Thus there remains a very real need for more specific vocational guidance offerings for the Summer Occupational Training Center enrollee.

Item No. 13 asked the parents, "Do you feel you know what further educational and occupational training is most advisable for your child? 14 out of 22 parents responded affirmatively and suggested various forms of specific job training or educational remediation. This 2/3 of the parents (as compared with 5/6 of the teachers' responses) felt they know what their children's further educational and training needs were. If it is true that the teachers are that much more certain about such matters, it would seem that the teachers have not succeeded in communicating this information to the parents, and this further gives evidence of the need for more parent workshops and other forms of parent-teacher contact.

Item No. 14 asked, "Does your son have any specific hobbies or avocational interests? If yes, please describe." All of the parents responded affirmatively, whereas only 57% of the teachers had. Thus, the results are the reverse of those obtained in the preceding question. That is, the parents are

evidently much more aware of the trainees' hobbies than are the teachers. This further illustrates the need for more two-way communication between parents and teachers. The types of hobbies reported by parents and teachers did not appear to differ substantially.

Items No. 15 - 20 also dealt with the students' avocational, leisure-time, and recreational interests. The item contents and the number of parents who responded affirmatively follow:

Item. No.	Content	Number of "Yes" responses (N = 22)
15.	Since entering the Summer Program has he made any progress towards the development of avocational interests?	15
16.	Does he have any established recreational and leisure-time pursuits?	18
17.	Has he made any progress in this area this summer?	10
18.	Is he capable of independently selecting his own leisure-time and recreational activities?	20
19.	Has he made any progress towards this goal this summer?	19
20.	Is he aware of the existence and location of: a) local recreation centers such as Y's boys clubs, etc.?	17
	b) movie theaters in his neighborhood?	19
	c) bowling alleys in his neighborhood?	19
	d) swimming facilities in his neighborhood?	16
	e) public parks in his neighborhood?	21
	f) municipal facilities, such as police and fire stations, post offices, and health centers in his neighborhood?	19

The parents' proportion of affirmative replies to items 15 - 20 was generally higher than those of the teachers. Since most of the contents dealt with the home-oriented, rather than school-oriented activities, knowledge and interests, it seems reasonable to assume that the parents' responses are the more accurate. At any rate, here too, it would appear that more communication between parents and teachers would give a more rounded picture of the trainees to each. In the main, then, the parents supported the teachers' view of the students as being fairly knowledgeable concerning the existence and location of their community's resources.

Items 21 - 27 required the parents to respond "Yes" or "No" to questions pertaining to the students' handling of money, transportation tokens, and communication. The item contents and results follow:

Item No. 1 Content	Number of "Yes" responses (N = 22)
21. Has he demonstrated to you that he knows the value of money and can use it responsibly?	8
22. Does he use his transportation tokens responsibly?	21
23. Does he know the money equivalent of these tokens?	19
24. Can he communicate effectively with you?	22
25. Can he communicate effectively with his fellow students?	19
26. Does he communicate well enough to obtain employment?	11
27. Does he have any communication problems which would interfere with his ability to socialize with his peers?	5

The parents gave a dimmer view of the students' knowledge of money and the ability to use it responsibly. Evidently, the teachers, in their necessarily more limited view, have erroneously believed the students to be more adept in this area than they are. Again, this points to the need for more parent-teacher communications as well as the possible use of role-playing and other simulation procedures involving the use of money. The results of the Parents' Questionnaires items 22-27 did not differ in proportion of "Yes" responses significantly from those of the Teachers Questionnaires. That is, the parents agreed with the teachers in believing that the students knew the value of their transportation tokens and used them responsibly, that they communicated effectively with their peers and adults with whom they were familiar, but that about only half of the students communicate well enough to obtain employement. Here, again, we would recommend role-playing, psychodramatic, and other simulation techniques, specifically selected to enhance the trainees' employment-communication skills.

Item No. 20 asked the parents whether or not their children had any cultural interests or pursuits and to list them, if any. In 21 out of 22 cases, the responses were affirmative. This proportion is very much higher than that of the teachers who responded affirmatively in only 15 out of 60 cases. The parents' estimates are probably more accurate since they have a greater opportunity to witness the trainees leisure-time activities. The parents reported musical interests as the primary ones, with "arts and crafts, folk dancing, photography, printing, reading, and T.V." being mentioned as well. Once again, this suggests that more parent-teacher conferences would provide the Occupational Training Center staff with a better grasp of the students' full range of potentials and interests.

Half of the parents questioned expressed the belief that their children's cultural horizons had been broadened since entering the Summer Program (Item No. 30). This proportion was lower than that reported by the teachers. Based on the immediately preceding item, it seems possible that the teachers believed many of the students' cultural interests arose anew during this summer whereas the parents had observed those same interests in their children prior to this summer.

The parents' responses to the next four questions (items No. 36 - 39) dealing with their children's social adjustment were as follows:

Item No.	Contents	Number of "Yes" responses N = 22
36.	Is he able to relate to his peers in a satisfactory manner?	19
37.	Is he well liked by his peers?	21
38.	Does he seem to have any friends among his fellow trainees?	19
39.	Can he relate appropriately to members of the opposite sex?	14

These proportions of affirmative replies were almost identical to those reported by the teachers. That is, the students were almost all seen as relating well to their same-sex peers but about a third of the trainees were seen as being unable to relate appropriately to members of the opposite sex. Once again, we would urge that future Occupational Training Center programs incorporate the use of psychodramatic types of techniques focussing on overcoming the students' difficulties in socializing with members of the opposite sex.

Item No. 40 asked the parents to "Describe his social adjustment and indicate what problems he has in this area, if any." Only one parent reported "good adjustment". The remaining 21 students were described as having problems in this area. The most frequent problems referred to were bashfulness, quietness, and moodiness (this was true of the teachers'reports,too). Other problems mentioned included "inability to relate to the opposite sex, preferences for older or younger people rather than his agemates, bossiness, and an inability to accept the fact that he does not "fit in" certain social situations." The teachers, in comparison to the parents, seemed quite unaware of the frequency and nature of the students' social adjustment problems. We would again make two oft-repeated recommendations for future Occupational Training Center programs, as means of alleviating the problems involved, namely, greater use of parent-teacher

conferences and the use of psychodramatic, simulation and group therapy type techniques to help the students overcome their social adjustment difficulties. However, community-wide education of "normal" people would also be necessary if these students, as well as retardates in general, are to achieve maximal success in their interpersonal relationships.

Item No. 41 asked the parents whether they believed that their children related appropriately to the Occupational Training Center staff. All responded affirmatively and in agreement with the teachers' assessment of this same issue.

Items No. 42 - 47 dealt with the students' attendance, punctuality, enjoyment of the Summer Occupational Training Center program, and the parents' satisfaction with the program. The parents' responses (in agreement with the results of the Teacher Questionnaires) indicated that there were no substantive problems in these areas.

Item 48 asked the parents to list the specific features of the program that they felt had proven most helpful to their children. All features of the program were mentioned, with trips and shops mentioned specifically most often. This and related questions indicated clearly that the parents were genuinely appreciative of the opportunity to have their children attend the Summer Occupational Training Center program, both for the benefits which accrue to their children and for the resulting lessened burden they, as parents, have during the summer months.

Item No. 49 asked the parents, "In what way has the program failed him, if any?" Most of the parents did not express the belief that the program had failed the students. Out of 22, only 4 parents listed any failures. They mentioned the need for: paid work (as had been the case in the Brooklyn Occupational Training Center in previous years), more clerical and typing training, more swimming, private busses instead of use of public transportation, and more integration of the Educables and Trainables. Also, it was mentioned by a parent, that the program was too strenuous.

Finally, in Item No. 50, the parents were asked, "What additional Occupational Training Center Summer Programs would be of help to your son?" The recommendations involved "paid work,

extension of the program to enrollees up to age 25, more typing, clerical work, sewing, swimming, educational remediation, vocational training, speech therapy, physical education, beauty culture training, practical nursing training, and total financing of trips, including admission fees."

For the most part, judging from these last two items, the parents and teachers are in substantial agreement concerning the needs of the students and how they can best be met by future programs.

C. THE STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRES: The first ten items of the Student Questionnaire required only a "Yes" or "No" answer. The item contents(which needed to be altered at times to help the student comprehend) and the number of affirmative replies (out of the total we students sampled) follow:

Item No.	Content	Number of "Yes"Responses N=23
1.	Do you know the different shops and programs in the OTC?	19
2.	Do you think you will continue in the OTC after this summer?	20
3.	Do your parents know about the OTC's programs?	23
5.	Do your parents like your coming to the OTC?	23
6.	Do your parents come to OTC parent meetings?	6
7.	Can you travel between your home and the OTC?	22
8.	Can you use public transportation to make short trips within (Brooklyn or Staten Island)?	15
9.	Do you know your way around your neighborhood?	23

Item No.	Contents	Number of "Yes" responses N = 23
10.	Can you use public transportation throughout New York City?	6
11.	Since entering the Summer OTC program have you learned to travel by yourself?	20

The students' responses to these items were generally in agreement with the teachers' and parents' reports. They felt that they and their parents know what the Summer Occupational Training Center is all about, that their parents like them to attend, but that only a small proportion of their parents attend meetings at the Occupational Training Center. Thus, as was observed from the teachers' and parents' responses, the program seems to have failed to provide for as much parent-teacher interaction as would seem desireable. In the opinion of the Teaching & Learning evaluation team, this should most definitely be remedied by future programs. As the parents and teachers had observed, the students seem to have no difficulty in traveling between home and the Occupational Training Center or knowing their way around their neighborhood. However, one third of the students reported being unable to travel independently throughout their home borough, and almost three-fourths claimed to be unable to do so throughout the city. Even though most of the students feel that they have already been given some help of this kind by the program, more travel training and confidence-building travel experiences are clearly needed by the students if they are ever to fully utilize their vocational and recreational opportunities.

Items 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, and 19 dealt with the students' specific job interests, hobbies, leisure time pursuits, and recreational activities. Fifteen out of 23 students reported having specific job interests, all 23 reported having hobbies, 13 out of 23 claimed to have developed new hobbies or interests since entering the Summer Occupational Training Center program, 20 out of 23 said that they go dancing, bowling, or swimming regularly, 11 out of 23 claimed to be able to initiate their own leisure and recreational activities, and 20 out of 23 said they do more of this since the summer program began. These results, which were generally supported by the teachers' and parents' reports, suggest that the Summer Occupational Training Centers programs have been very successful in this area. The lives of the enrollees apparently have been greatly enhanced by their

Summer Occupational Training Center trips and other recreational experiences. As such, the students' seemed now better equipped to fill their spare time with satisfying, meaningful, and probably growth-producing activities.

Item No. 20 asked the students whether or not they knew the location of various neighborhood resources. The results were as follows:

a. 14 out of 23 said they know the location of Y's, boys' clubs, etc.

b. 21 out of 23 reported knowing where their neighborhood movie theaters are.

c. 18 out of 23 claimed knowledge of the location of neighborhood bowling alleys.

d. 17 out of 23 knew where their local swimming facilities are.

e. 21 out of 23 reported knowing where their neighborhood public parks are, and

f. 21 out of 23 said they knew the location of municipal facilities, such as police and fire stations, post offices, and health centers in their neighborhoods.

These results are in keeping with the teachers' and parents' observations that the students were generally knowledgeable about such matters. The lack of totally affirmative replies probably reflects the fact that not all of the neighborhood facilities asked about actually existed in every student's immediate vicinity.

In item No. 23, only 17 out of the 23 students reported knowing how much a transportation token costs. This is very surprising, considering the fact that the students were issued tokens for their daily trips and reportedly use public transportation independently. It also suggested that both parents and teachers erroneously attributed greater knowledge to the students in this area than is actually the case. Clearly, there

is need for further education here, and it might well be incorporated into curricula dealing with travel, money, and general arithmetic.

In item No. 25, which asked, "Do you feel you can talk well with your fellow students?", 20 out of 23 students responded affirmatively. This supported the parents' and teachers' belief that the students can communicate effectively among themselves.

Items No. 29 - 30 dealt with the students' cultural interests and pursuits. (There was difficulty in phrasing such questions in a meaningful manner that was within the grasp of the students' limited verbal skills. However, that an attempt be made to do so was deemed necessary by the fact that stimulation of such interests was an avowed purpose of the Summer Occupational Training Centers programs). 15 out of the 23 students reported having such "special" interests but only 7 claimed that such interests had broadened since entering the program. These results appear to have doubtful validity because of the communication problems involved, however.

The next three items dealt with the students' social relationships. The results were as follows:

Item No.	Content	Number of "Yes" responses (N = 23)
37.	Do the other trainees like you?	23
38.	Do you have any friends among your fellow trainees?	21
39.	Do you have any friends among the (opposite sex, "boys" or "girls"?)	12

The results are fully in accord with the parents' and teachers' views. They, like the students themselves, believe the trainees capable of developing satisfactory relationships with their same-sex peers, but have difficulties in relating to members of the opposite sex. We would therefore, repeat our recommendation that Summer (and regular) Occupational Training Centers programs employ

role-playing, simulation, and other "psychodramatic" techniques designed to help these youngsters deal more effectively with this important and very sensitive area of their lives.

Items No. 42, 44, 45, 46, and 47 asked the students about their attendance, promptness and satisfaction with the Summer Occupational Training Centers program. As was true of the teachers' and parents' reports, no substantive difficulties seem to exist in these areas. The trainees clearly enjoyed the program and presented very little problems in terms of absence or lateness. The good attendance is especially impressive to us in light of the fact that attendance problems have been found to be rampant among several other New York City educational programs recently evaluated by Teaching & Learning evaluation teams.

Item No. 48 asked the trainees, "What do you like best about the program?" The items mentioned, and the numbers of students who mentioned them, follow: shops, 15; trips, 13; swimming, 4; bowling, 3; zoo, 1; movies, 1; "all the teachers," 1; and "everything", 1. As was true with the parents and teachers, the students evidently found all aspects of the program rewarding.

When asked "What don't you like about the program?", only one student voiced a complaint. He said, "You have to stay in school when it's too hot". (A Teaching & Learning evaluation team member shared this students' view that the school rooms did become unpleasantly warm at times).

Finally, the trainees were asked, "What other programs would you like to have in the Occupational Training Centers? Only 8 of the 23 students made suggestions. These were: additional shops (mentioned by 4 trainees), math, gym, more movies, more girls, and more women teachers.

VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

1. The 1970 Summer Occupational Training Centers programs (1 in Brooklyn and 1 in Richmond) for approximately 170 mentally retarded trainees, aged 17 - 21, were designed to serve the summer educational, prevocational, and social needs of current and prospective Occupational Training Centers enrollees.

2. The staff of eleven instructors along with directors, a guidance counselor, and paraprofessional aides were experienced in teaching the retarded.

3. The programs were found to be well organized, ambitiously implemented, and thoroughly enjoyed by the enrollees and very well received by their parents.

4. Whereas the shop programs of both Occupational Training Centers were similar in structure and content, the Richmond Occupational Training Center was found to be much more highly planned and structured than the Brooklyn Occupational Training Center. Whereas the entire Richmond program, including trips, was carefully planned prior to the onset of the program, the Brooklyn staff, during daily morning meetings, planned their trips and recreational activities a day or two in advance. Another major difference was in the grouping procedures. The Richmond program segregated the students on the basis of sex and Trainable-Educable status whereas the Brooklyn program flexibly grouped students on the basis of interest in a given activity without respect to sex or Trainable - Educable status.

5. The Summer Occupational Training Center programs, according to our observations and the quantitative results obtained from teachers, parents, and students, were found to have successfully completed their missions with very few exceptions. That is, a very worthwhile summer program was established for young adult retardates which enhanced their educational, prevocational, recreational, social, and travel potentials. Of course, in the brief period the summer program operated, just so much could be accomplished in any of these areas.

6. The students, by their own reports, as well as those obtained from their parents and teachers, were left at the end of the program with many important unmet, or partially unmet needs that could be handled by their future Occupational Training Center experiences. These major needs, and suggested ways of dealing with them, follow:

   a. The students' capacity to travel independently on public transportation throughout New York City remains quite limited. Much more extensive travel training is obviously required if these students are to be able to maximize their occupational and recreational opportunities.

   b. The students' ability to relate to members of the opposite sex remains a problem area. Whereas they seem able to relate to, form friendship with, and communicate with their same-sex peers, they seem incapable of doing so with the opposite sex. It was recommended that role-playing, simulation, and other "psychodramatic" techniques be employed for dealing with this problem.

   c. Many students, in the view of their parents and teachers, lack the communication skills involved in obtaining employment. In addition to greater speech therapy offerings, future Occupational Training Center programs would be well advised to utilize role-playing, simulation, and "psychodramatic" techniques in this area, too.

   d. More help is urgently needed in the area of money mathematics and usage. For instance, many students did not even know the money value of the transportation tokens they were provided with. Most parents felt that their children were unable to use money responsibly. Traditional techniques, as well as simulation procedures involving shopping, budgeting , etc. should be employed.

   e. The students still need much more help and guidance in formulating specific vocational goals as well as concrete realistic experiences with the machines,

materials, settings and procedures that they would actually use in employment settings. Paid part-time work in actual commercial and industrial settings seems to be a very worthwhile goal towards which future programs should strive.

APPENDIX A

Student Name _____ OTC _____

Age _____ School Grade as of 6/70 _____

Sex _____ Date _____

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

Teacher's Name _____

	Yes	No
1. Does this trainee seem to know the purposes of and the programs involved in the OTC?	____	____
2. Does it seem likely that he will continue in the OTC after this summer?	____	____
3. Have his parents been orientated to the OTC's programs and purposes?	____	____
4. Have you had any direct contact with his parents?	____	____
5. Do his parents seem ready to support his participation in the OTC?	____	____
6. Have his parents become actively involved in OTC parent workshops?	____	____
7. Is this child capable of traveling between his home and the OTC?	____	____
8. Can he independently use public transportation to make short trips within his home borough?	____	____
9. Does he seem to have a good grasp of the layout of his neighborhood?	____	____
10. Is he capable of using public transportation throughout New York City?	____	____
11. Since entering the Summer OTC program, has he gained in capacity to independently use public transportation?	____	____
12. Does this trainee have any specific occupational perference or interests? If yes, please describe.	____	____

_____

_____

_____

	YES	NO
13. Do you feel that you know what further educational and occupational training is most advisable for this child? If yes, please describe _____	____	____
14. Does this trainee have any specific hobbies or avocational interests? If yes, please describe _____	____	____
15. Since entering the summer program, has he made any progress towards the development of avocational interests?	____	____
16. Does he have any established recreational and leisure-time pursuits?	____	____
17. Has he made any progress in this area this summer? If yes, please describe _____	____	____
18. Is he capable of independent selecting and initiating his own leisure time and recreational activities?	____	____
19. Has he made any progress towards this goal this summer?	____	____
20. Is he aware of the existence and location of:		
a) local recreation centers such as Y's, boys clubs, etc.	____	____
b) movie theaters in his neighborhood?	____	____
c) bowling alleys in his neighborhood?	____	____
d) swimming facilities in his neighborhood?	____	____
e) public parks in his neighborhood?	____	____
f) municipal facilities, such as police and fire stations, post offices, and health centers in his neighborhood?	____	____

		YES	NO
21.	Has he demonstrated to you that he knows the value of money and can use it responsibly?	____	____
22.	Does he use his transportation tokens responsibly?	____	____
23.	Does he know the money equivalent of these tokens?	____	____
24.	Can he communicate effectively with you?	____	____
25.	Can he communicate effectively with his fellow students?	____	____
26.	Does he communicate well enough to obtain employment?	____	____
27.	Does he have any communication problems which would interfere with his ability to socialize with peers?	____	____
28.	Should he receive professional speech therapy help during the upcoming school year?	____	____
29.	Does he have any arts-and-crafts or musical interest? If yes, please describe _____	____	____
	_____		
	_____		
30.	Have his arts-and-crafts or musical interests broadened since he entered the Summer Program?	____	____
31.	Does he have any noticeable problems with gross motor coordination? If yes, please describe	____	____
	_____		
	_____		
32.	Has his motor coordination improved since entering this Summer's Program?	____	____

		YES	NO
33.	Does he have any noticeable problems with manual dexterity? If yes, please describe _____ _____ _____	____	____
34.	Has his manual dexterity improved since entering this program?	____	____
35.	Regarding his social functioning, is he: independent semi-independent very dependent (check one)	____ ____ ____	____ ____ ____
36.	Is he able to relate to his peers in a satisfactory manner?	____	____
37.	Is he well liked by his peers?	____	____
38.	Does he seem to have any friends among his fellow-trainees?	____	____
39.	Can he relate appropriately to members of the opposite sex?	____	____
40.	Describe his social adjustment and indicate what problems he has in this area, if any. _____ _____ _____ _____		
41.	Does he relate to the OTC staff appropriately? If no, indicate what problems exist _____ _____ _____ _____	____	____

		YES	NO
42.	Is his attendance regular?	____	____
43.	What is his percentage of daily attendance? _____		
44.	Does he have a problem with lateness?	____	____
45.	Has his attendance and/or lateness improved since entering the Summer Program?	____	____
46.	Does he seem to be enjoying the Summer OTC Program?	____	____
47.	Do his parents seem to be satisfied with the program?	____	____

48. What features of the program have proven most helpful to him? Please list specific shops, programs, trips, and other activities _____

_____

_____

49. In what way has the program failed him, if any _____

_____

_____

50. What additional OTC Summer Programs would be of help to this trainee? _____

_____

_____

_____

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION IN EVALUATING YOUR PROGRAM!

APPENDIX B

Parent's Name _____

Student Name _____ OTC _____

Age _____ School Grade as of 6/70 _____

Sex _____ Date _____

Interviewer: _____

PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Teacher's Name _____

	Yes	No
1. Does your son seem to know the purposes of and the programs involved in the OTC?	_____	_____
2. Does it seem likely that he will continue in the OTC after this summer?	_____	_____
3. Have you been orientated to the OTC's programs and purposes?	_____	_____
4. Have you had any direct contact with his teachers?	_____	_____
5. Do you support his participation in the OTC?	_____	_____
6. Have you become actively involved in OTC parent workshops?	_____	_____
7. Is your child capable of traveling between his home and the OTC?	_____	_____
8. Can he independently use public transportation to make short trips within his home borough?	_____	_____
9. Does he seem to have a good grasp of the lay-out of his neighborhood?	_____	_____
10. Is he capable of using public transportation throughout New York City?	_____	_____
11. Since entering the Summer OTC Program, has he gained in capacity to independently use public transportation?	_____	_____

	Yes	No
12. Does this trainee have any specific occupational perference or interests? If yes, please describe. _____	_____	_____
13. Do you feel you know what further educational and occupational training is most advisable for your child? If yes, please describe._____	_____	_____
14. Does your son have any specific hobbies or vocational interests? If yes, please describe. _____	_____	_____
15. Since entering the summer program, has he made any progress towards the development of avocational interests?	_____	_____
16. Does he have any established recreational and leisure-time pursuits?	_____	_____
17. Has he made any progress in this area this summer? If yes, please describe. _____	_____	_____
18. Is he capable of independent selecting and initiating his own leisure time and recreational activities?	_____	_____
19. Has he made any progress towards this goal this summer?	_____	_____

		YES	NO
20.	Is he aware of the existence and location of:		
	a) local recreation centers such as Y's, boys clubs, etc.?	____	____
	b) movie theaters in his neighborhood?	____	____
	c) bowling alleys in his neighborhood?	____	____
	d) swimming facilities in his neighborhood?	____	____
	e) public parks in his neighborhood?	____	____
	f) municipal facilities, such as police and fire stations, post offices, and health centers in his neighborhood?	____	____
21.	Has he demonstrated to you that he knows the value of money and can use it responsibly?	____	____
22.	Does he use his transportation tokens responsibly?	____	____
23.	Does he know the money equivalent of these tokens?	____	____
24.	Can he communicate effectively with you?	____	____
25.	Can he communicate effectively with his fellow students?	____	____
26.	Does he communicate well enough to obtain employment?	____	____
27.	Does he have any communication problems which would interfere with his ability to socialize with peers?	____	____
29.	Does he have any arts-and-crafts or musical interests? If yes, please describe.	____	____
	_____		
	_____		
30.	Have his arts-and-crafts or musical interests broadened since he entered the Summer Program?	____	____
36.	Is he able to relate to his peers in a satisfactory manner?	____	____
37.	Is he liked by his peers?	____	____

		Yes	No
38.	Does he seem to have any friends among his fellow-trainees?	_____	_____
39.	Can he relate appropriately to members of the opposite sex?	_____	_____

40. Describe his social adjustment and indicate what problems he has in this area, if any.

_____

_____

_____

_____

41. Does he relate to the OTC staff appropriately? If no, indicate what problems exist. _____

_____

_____

_____

42.	Is his attendance regular?	_____	_____

43. What is his percentage of daily attendance?

_____

44.	Does he have problems with lateness?	_____	_____
45.	Has his attendance and/or lateness improved since entering the Summer Program?	_____	_____
46.	Does he seem to be enjoying the Summer OTC Program?	_____	_____
47.	Are you satisfied with the program?	_____	_____

48. What features of the program have proven most helpful to him? Please list specific shops, programs, trips, and other activities.

_____

_____

_____

49. In what way has the program failed him, if any?

_____

_____

_____

50. What additional OTC Summer Programs would be of help to your son? _____

_____

_____

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION IN EVALUATING YOUR PROGRAM!

APPENDIX C

Student Name _____ OTC _____

Age _____ School Grade as of 6/70 _____

Sex _____ Date _____

Interviewer _____

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Teacher's Name _____

	Yes	No
1. Do you know the different shops and programs in the OTC?	____	____
2. Do you think you will continue in the OTC after this summer?	____	____
3. Do your parents know about the OTC's programs?	____	____
5. Do your parents like your coming to the OTC?	____	____
6. Do your parents come to OTC parent meetings?	____	____
7. Can you travel between your home and OTC?	____	____
8. Can you use public transportation to make short trips within Brooklyn?	____	____
9. Do you know your way around your neighborhood?	____	____
10. Can you use public transportation throughout New York City?	____	____
11. Since entering the Summer OTC program, have you learned to travel by yourself?	____	____
12. Do you have any special job interests? If yes, please describe.	____	____

_____

_____

_____

		Yes	No
14.	Do you have any special hobbies or job interests? If yes, please describe. _____ _____ _____	___	___
15.	Since entering the summer program, have you developed any new hobbies or interests?	___	___
16.	Do you go to any dances or bowl or swim regularly?	___	___
17.	Have you done any more of this this summer? If yes, please describe. _____ _____ _____ _____	___	___
18.	Do you pick what you would like to do for fun yourself?	___	___
19.	Do you do any more of this this summer?	___	___
20.	Do you know where a:		
	a. local recreational centers such as Y's, boys clubs, etc. is?	___	___
	b. movie theaters in your neighborhood are?	___	___
	c. Bowling alleys in your neighborhood are?	___	___
	d. swimming facilities in your neighborhood are?	___	___
	e. public parks in your neighborhood are?	___	___
	f. municipal facilities, such as police and fire stations, post offices, and health centers in your neighborhood are?	___	___
23.	Do you know how much a token costs?	___	___
25.	Do you feel you can talk well with your fellow students?	___	___
29.	Do you have any special interests or things? If yes, please describe. _____ _____ _____	___	___

		Yes	No
30.	Do you do any more things since you entered the Summer Program?	___	___
37.	Do the other trainees like you?	___	___
38.	Do you have any friends among your fellow-trainees?	___	___
39.	Do you have any friends among the girls (boys)?	___	___
42.	Do you come every day?	___	___
44.	Do you come on time?	___	___
45.	Has your attendance and/or lateness improved since entering the summer program?	___	___
46.	Are you enjoying the Summer OTC Program?	___	___
47.	Are you happy with the program?	___	___

48. What features of the program have proven most helpful to you? Please list specific shops, programs, trips, and other activities. _____

_____

_____

49. What do you like best about the program? _____

_____

What don't you like about the program? _____

_____

50. What other programs would you like to have in the OTC?

_____

_____

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION IN EVALUATING YOUR PROGRAM!

SUMMER PROGRAM FOR MENTALLY RETARDED
YOUNG ADULTS OCCUPATIONAL TRAINING CENTERS

EVALUATION STAFF

Evaluation Director:	Fredric Nalven
Evaluation Assistant:	Adela Oliver
Evaluation Consultants:	Edsel L. Erickson Edmund W. Gordon Lee M. Joiner Alan J. Simon